

Meeting Notes

from the

Data Sharing Partnership Meeting Conducted at the Medford County Courthouse October 26, 2006

This was the third of six Data Sharing Partnership meetings held around the state of Oregon on behalf of the Association of Oregon Counties and the Oregon Geographic Information Council. The objectives of this meeting were to:

- Present the data sharing concept and rationale to local government officials
- Identify issues, concerns, items of key interest from meeting attendees
- Document the findings from the meeting and share information and ideas

What the Data Sharing Partnership Should or Should NOT Be

- Funding provided for accuracies sufficient for local government business purposes
- Sharing should be mandated
- Coordination of data development and use should be required, State to local & local to State
- Standards need to be developed for all shared data
- Partnership should result in integrated, standardized, consistent statewide base data
- Partnership should include education and training for users and providers
- Locals need to be protected from liability and risk associated with data sharing
- Need for a sustainable funding model
- Agency uses for shared data should be documented as incentive for partnering
- Partnership should not be an unfunded mandate
- It should not be contingent on local governments using GIS
- It should not result in more work for local governments

Barriers

- Stewardship is not currently assigned for data sets and there's no mechanism for assignment
- Funding is insufficient at all levels
- Accuracy needs are different from local to State for various purposes
- Staffing resources are insufficient and difficult to maintain for any length of time
- State doesn't offer to share data now, isn't proactive about sharing data that could be useful
- No existing inventory of data or technology at local level
- Metadata isn't sufficient for sharing – funding for metadata insufficient

Opportunities

- State could take on integration and edge-matching for shared data

- Maps and data could be improved by sharing, with feedback from users
- Building permit data from DCBS e-permitting system could be shared with local govts.
- Imagery could be offered on a regular cycle, with an improved DEM
- State could provide HW/SW/tools for local govt., particularly if local govts. work together to aggregate data first for a region

Concerns

The frequency of update for various data sets needs to be determined and agreed upon. Should the shared data be updated on the same schedule for all data sets, either weekly, monthly, quarterly or whatever, OR should the data be updated on different schedules based on how dynamic the data set is?

Privacy issues

Risk/Liability issues – may need legislation for this; people often use older data, increasing risk

Actions or Ideas for Next Steps

Citizens should be part of the partnership organizational or management structure

Partnership should be a phased approach

Agency uses for shared data should be documented as incentive for partnering

Inventory should be conducted of existing base data and technology at the local level

Participants in Medford Meeting

Lea Light, City of Ashland
 Tony Bakke, Public Works Management, Inc.
 Keith Massie, Jackson County GIS
 Teresa Vonn, OR Dept. of Forestry
 Dennis Glover, BLM
 Dan Ross, Jackson Co. Assessor
 Mike Schneyder, Josephine Co. Assessor

Josephine Co. Public Works
 David Renz, City of Medford
 Toni Fisher, Curry County GIS
 Josephine County Assessor's Office
 Ann Cacka, Jackson County
 Cy Smith, Dept. of Administrative Services

<<I didn't capture all the names of attendees, if you were there and your name isn't listed, please let me know (503-378-6066 or cy.smith@state.or.us), or if your name is listed but you can help me fill in the list, please contact me.>>